THE HERALD OF SALVATION.

EDITED BY THE REV. PITT MORSE.

"Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men." St. Luke, 2. 14.

"How beautiful are the feet of him that publisheth salvation!" Isa. 52. 7.

VOL. I. SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1823. NO. 11.

CONTROVERSIAL.

Concluded from page 76.

From the Niagara Patriot of March 12th 1822.

To the Editor of the Niagara Patriot.

SIR—If you can admit the following article into your paper it is thought it would tend to promote free and candid inquiry upon the all interesting subject of man's eternal destiny, and from the present state of the discussion, it is confidently expected you will give it an insertion.

TO THE PUBLIC.

Some explanation should be made, before the public mind is again invited to the subject under discussion about a year since, which was published in the Patriot and Journal. No subject of greater, nor even of equal importance ever demanded the attention of the human mind, than the subject of the final and endless *destiny* of the human race This subject is now very generally agitated, and it will not be in the power of any, however interested, to prevent an impartial investigation and candid decision on this momentous inquiry. In the Patriot of July 11th, 1820, was published an article which I wrote for the purpose of calling on a certain writer to recant his public detraction, or to prove that the doctrine of *impartial* grace and eternal goodness is not *true*; that writer, to my knowledge, has done neither. A writer in the Journal of July 25th, 1820, under the signature of 'Truth,' took up the subject as my opponent; he however treated it with language so unbecoming that, (if I am correctly informed) the Editor of the *P*atriot refused its admission into his paper, it was therefore published in the Journal. A reply to the piece signed 'Truth' was published in the *P*atriot of August 15th, 1820, since which time I knew not that any answer had been made to my last communication, until October, 1821, when I first saw the article which was published in the Journal of August 29th, 1820, and to which a reply is now made. I have been thus particular that the public may know what has occasioned so long delay. BENEVOLUS.

Reply to the piece signed 'Truth' contained in the Journal of August 29th, 1820.

I sincerely regret to discover the same illiberal and inimical *spirit* in this last article signed 'Truth,' which I had pointed out in his former communication, and which he could not deny, as may be seen by the following expression of his to the Editor, "There might have been a *little* appearance of severity in the note I handed you," but for that unchristian *bitterness* he makes no apology, nor does he cease to exercise the same *spirit*: for proof, notice the following expressions in his last article—'cloven foot,' 'wresting of the scripture *intentional* must we suppose?' 'I pity the man who *will blind* his eyes,' 'the Aposties of error,' 'after all the *puny* attempts of B.' with other similar expressions, which are not only destitute of dignity and candour, but which evince a *temper* embittered with the doctrine of *unmerciful vengeance* and *endless enmity*, and characterized by *partiality*. To point out the errors of our fellow creatures and charitably give instruction, is rendering them service—but the man who will intimate that the *intention* of his opponent is dishonest, is very far from being candid. But I desire to overlook this *censoriousness*—and would fain 'overcome evil with good' and proceed to the merits of the subject. I promised that when my questions 'were answered in language *becoming* the subject,' I would notice the answer—though the language is not altogether becoming, yet my opponent may think himself entitled to some *notice*. It is proper to observe the manner in which Truth concludes his first article—'I shall not need to follow him [Benevolus] one step till he has satisfactorily answered these three queries,' which he had proposed—after I had answered him he 'follows me' with a reply, now he must admit either, that I 'satisfactorily answered' his queries, or that he wrote his last piece *needlessly*, or that he was mistaken in his statement, there is no alternative.

The point in debate is, whether the Greek word '*aionion*' rendered *eternal* may on any occasion, be properly used in a limited sense, for if it may be used in such sense, my argument is gained; altho' this word may be properly used in an unlimited sense, for all that my argument requires, is, that I should prove the word *equivocal*, or used in different senses according to the nature of the subject to which it is applied—my opponent will then be obliged to prove that all punishment is endless in its nature, (and this would involve himself in inextricable misery) or retreat from the field of controversy.

One argument in my communication Truth has carefully avoided. I have shown that the same words which are applied to the *duration* of punishment, were applied to the *duration* of the Mosaic dispensation—and if these words prove the *endless duration* of *misery*, the same words *equally* prove the *endless continuation* of the Mosaic dispensation and christianity is totally and una-

totally destroyed! I trust this argument will not be overlooked.

My opponent says 'Any one acquainted with the original language of the New Testament knows very well that 'aeion' signifies *always being, always-existing*, and is as steadily appropriated to this sense, as any word in the English language is to the sense given it.' Here we are fairly at issue, and if I do not prove my opponent mistaken, I will make an acknowledgment, and if I should prove him mistaken, I trust conscience will point him to *his* duty. In Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon 'aion' is thus defined. 'aion, aevum, mundus, saeculem.' in Young's or Ainsworth's Latin English Dictionary the word 'aevum' is thus defined, 'aevum, 1 eternity, 2 an age, the life of man, 3 time, 4 an action done in time, 5 one's age, 6 old age:' the definition of 'mundus & saeculum' may be examined at leisure: the very essential mistake of my opponent is now as visible as the sun at noon day.

If any wish further information, Dr. Hartly, Dr. Chauncey, Dr. Stonehouse and other learned writers who have written particularly upon the signification of these Greek words, would doubtless satisfy the candid inquirer.

I shall now refer to some scripture passages where 'aionion' is obviously used in a limited sense. 1 Corinth. 2, 7, 'Which God ordained before the (aionion) *world* began.' Again St. Math. 13, 39. 'The harvest is the *end* of the (aionios) *world*. Likewise Titus 1, 2, 'In hope of *(Zoes aioniou) eternal life* which God that cannot lie, promised *(pro kronon aionion) before the world* began.' In these passages and many others, the word 'aion or aionion' either as a substantive, or an adjective, is evidently used in a limited sense.

It is also very well known that good authors, often use the words *everlasting* and *eternal* in the English language both in a limited, and an unlimited sense; leaving the good understanding of their readers to determine the signification of the *words* by the nature of the *subject* to which they are applied: for example, in the 4th edition of Cumming's Ancient and Modern Geography pages 207 and 209 are the following expressions, 'The ground wears an *eternal* covering of ice'—'The earth seems covered with *eternal* snow.' Dr. Morse in his Universal Gazetteer describing Greenland says, 'This country is covered in most places, with *everlasting* ice and snow.' Will my opponent pretend to deny that the words *eternal* and *everlasting* are used in a limited sense in the above quotations? Does he not also know that the very same words are used in an *unlimited sense* when applied to *God* or whatever is *endless* in its *nature?* Truth says "one may as well undertake to prove that *endless* does not mean *never ending* as that *eternal* does not, or the word rendered *eternal* in the passages cited:' this we have already proved to be altogether a mistake.

My opponent says "Will Benevolus inform us whether there is any such thing as a proper eternity revealed in the New Testament, and if so in what form it is expressed? By what word in the original language of the new Testament would he express a proper eternity?' Reply. I think a proper eternity is revealed in the new Testament, and that life and happiness will not end because these have an imperishable and endless *foundation* in God 'who only hath immortality' and to whom all *final purposes* and *infinite consequences* must be referred. By referring to the words rendered, *incorruptible, immortal endless &c.* Truth will discover how a proper eternity is expressed in the original language of the new Testament.—Take for instance the passage found in Heb. 7, 16. 'Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of *(zoes akatalutou)* an ENDLESS life.'—Let this never be forgotten.

Having as I trust clearly shown both the limited and unlimited use of the words in dispute, both in the Greek and English languages, I will now offer a few words upon the subject of blasphemy. The Calvinist believes in total depravity, he must therefore admit that mankind know nothing of the HOLY GHOST until regenerated by the spirit of God, he also believes 'once in grace, always in grace' how then does he dispose of this subject? Will he say that one elected of God from all eternity, and illuminated by the Holy Spirit, (without which illumination he surely could not blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, for 'where there is no law, there is no transgression,' and where nothing is given, nothing is required,) can, by committing *blasphemy*, after having been regenerated, subject himself to endless damnation?

Truth labours to show want of candour in me, in my remarks upon the passage 'all manner of sins and blasphemies shall be forgiven unto men' because I inquired, 'when all sins are forgiven will any remain unforgiven?—This he says 'makes our Lord contradict himself,' &c. Is it possible that he could so far mistake my meaning as not to see that the only reason of my quoting that part of the passage only, was to show that blasphemy was not unpardonable in its nature?—It is truly surprising that he should not have discovered my meaning, especially when we

look at the following words which immediately precede what he quoted, where I had said, 'Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost appears to have been the malicious ascribing of the works of Christ to the power of Satan, by those who were eye witnesses of the operation of divine power; and the blasphemer could never obtain forgiveness while wilfully closing his eyes against the truth.' 'The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be;' but does it follow that the 'carnal mind' cannot be destroyed, and be succeeded by spiritual mindedness? As blasphemy is not unpardonable, for 'blasphemies shall be forgiven,' it is as easy for divine power to do away a blasphemous disposition, as to do away the 'carnal mind.' What Truth has written about 'the one being a case in which forgiveness could be extended, and the other a case in which it could not' is thought to be entirely a mistake. To suppose that some sins 'lay within the precincts of pardon,' and that others do not; is 'limiting the Holy One,' it is bounding the boundless mercy of God, and is expressly contrary to many scriptures, Isa. 1, 18, 'Come, now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord, though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow: though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.' 'Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the *sin* of the *world*.' without any exception. St. Paul says 'Christ came to save sinners, of whom I am chief.' If the *chief* of sinners are to be saved, much more those who are less sinful. In the 12th chap. of St Math. this subject is thus expressed 'whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this *world*, nor in the *world* to come." Observe, he does not say, 'neither in this *life*, neither in a future life, nor is this by any means his meaning. The meaning of the word 'aioni' here rendered *world* may be discovered by comparing it with St. Paul's use of the same word Heb. 9, 26. 'But now once in the end of the '*aionon*,' *world* hath he appeared to put away sin,' &c --In the end of what *world* did Christ make his appearance on earth? Why truly in the end of the Jewish *world* or *dispensation*. Hence the meaning of Christ evidently is, that the Jews, as a nation should not be forgiven their blasphemy, neither in the *world*, *age* or *dispensation* in which he came; nor in the *world*, *age* or *dispensation* during which the Gentiles should be gathered in; and after these two *worlds* or *dispensations* of divine Providence shall have ended, then the Jews, that blasphemous nation, shall be forgiven and brought to the enjoyment of God. Rom. 11, 25 and 26.—'For I would not brethren have you ignorant of this mystery, *lest ye should be wise in your own conceits*, that blindness in part has happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so *all* Israel shall be saved.' How sublime, how beautiful, how glorious is the grand economy of divine, unbounded, impartial grace!

I will now briefly show my view of *forgiveness*. Some suppose that the objects of *mercy* are liberated from the punishment which they *justly* deserve; and that the objects of *justice* are eternally excluded from mercy: thus they set the attributes of God at war with each other, and make that *war* as eternal as the Divine existence I venture to state that the volume of divine Inspiration does not state that Christ came to save one child of Adam from the punishment he justly deserves for his crimes: but on the contrary, the scriptures state that God *shall* render to *every* man according to his works. Christ came 'to save his people *from* their *sins*,' not *from* the punishment they *deserve*. If a child be saved from the punishment his disobedience deserves, the parent's law is violated; but if the child be saved from disobedience, he will be an obedient child.—If the forgiveness of God deliver man from the punishment he deserves, then those who are forgiven, never will be rewarded according to their works,' which violates many plain scripture testimonies *Forgiveness* is the manifestation of divine unchangeable goodness to sinners.—The doctrine of a forgiveness which admits of the sinner's receiving what he deserves, is clearly taught in the scriptures, Isa. 40, 2, 'Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is *pardoned*; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins.' Also Psalms 99, 8, 'Thou wast a God that *forgavest* them tho' thou tookest vengeance of their inventions.'

My opponent views 'the final condemnation of one in sin, with the same kind of feeling that he has when seeing the murderer suspended under the gallows.' The 'final condemnation' of any one, the scriptures say nothing of, and my opponent has not proved that there ever will be any such characters as the *finally* impenitent, he therefore ought not to have taken for *granted* the very thing in *dispute*. But let us examine his similitude of 'the murderer suspended under the gallows,' which he compares to the infliction of endless woe upon *some* sinners, while *others* are exempted who *equally* deserve this horrid doom. Now if human legislators had the power to reform the murderer and constitute him a dutiful citizen, would not *justice* and *humanity* dictate this course, rather than the infliction of *death*, the barbarous u-

sage of barbarous times? Let common sense reply, and let the rule of 'doing to others as we would that others should do unto us, be kept in view. That God possesses *power* to reform the *worst* of sinners will not be denied; and that any should be punished with *death*; if admitted at all, is admitted on account of the imbecility and deficiency of human authority.

My opponent has quoted my words 'He that reproaches the natural heart, reproaches natures God,' he then remarks, 'The cloven foot was almost visible here that there is no such thing as sin or guilt or *deserved* punishment in the universe.' Whether the appearance of 'the *cloven foot*' produced a partial delirium, or not, I cannot tell, but I do not recollect ever to have read a more unconnected, unmeaning phrase—cannot sin exist unless it be *natural* i. e. constitutional? Can man *deserve* no punishment for what he actually, practically and personally commits? Must all the *just* punishment man receives be for his *natural* constitution, or for the action of another person? Cannot a man feel *guilt* for what he does himself? Total and hereditary depravity, I humbly conceive is not taught in the divine volume. It is plain that God loves the sinner no better *after* regeneration, than *before*: for proof see Eph. 2, 4 and 5. 'But God who is rich in mercy, for his *great love* wherewith he *loved* us, even *when* we were *dead in sins*, hath quickened us together with Christ:' and to say that God loves *total depravity*, is absurd if not impious.

All the works of God are 'very good.'—'*Nature* is *just* as it was constituted by nature's God. 'The creature (man) was made subject to vanity.' Man did not make himself, *God* made him, and made him with the propensities of human nature. Man is not a sinner *naturally* or constitutionally, but *practically* and personally. No being can feel *guilt* for what *another* does; and notwithstanding all that is said about 'the fall' in modern theology, I see no more evidence to believe that we are *guilty* for Adam's *crime* than for all the crimes committed from the days of Adam to the present time, and that the mountain of human depravity is thus accumulating & increasing its burdens upon after generations, who come into the world *responsible* for all the crimes committed through all preceding ages!!

My opponent speaks of 'the penalty of the law,' 'the whole penalty of the law,' &c. & if I do not misunderstand him, he takes it for granted that the penalty of the law is endless damnation commonly called 'eternal death;' but as the scriptures no where state that the penalty of any law ever given to man and violated by him, is endless de he ought not to have taken this for gran After all the curses pronounced by or doxy upon mankind for the first transg sion, our Heavenly Father did not see fi pronounce a solitary curse upon the m the woman, or their posterity for that tra gression! Nor did he give the least intim tion of any eternal consequence which awa ed the transgressors. See *Gen.* 3, 17, 'Cu sed is the *ground* for thy sake, in sorro shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy lif and not to an endless eternity! Althoug the penalty of the law is not said, in th scriptures, to be endless death; yet th 'Shorter Catechism' which many have learn ed in their early youth, has the following 'All mankind by the fall lost communion with God, are under his wrath and curse, and so made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell forever.' This is one proposition. Immediately after, the same catechism contains the following 'God out of his mere good pleasure from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace with them, to deliver them out of a state of sin and misery, and bring them into a state of salvation by a Redeemer.' Here is another proposition which stands as directly opposite to the former, as any two propositions which can be stated. The first recognizes the whole human race under the endless wrath and curse of God: the second manifests the 'good pleasure' of God from all eternity towards some of those who have just been declared, under his eternal wrath and curse! But I rejoice that the word of God is free from such contradiction and absurdity. To suppose that God ever made a law which required the endless damnation of any whom he, from eternity intended to save, is to suppose that God acts without wisdom. If sin deserve endless punishment, as *all* are sinners and if every one shall receive what he deserves—then universal and endless damnation is the unavoidable portion of the human race! I trust Truth will now discover the force of my question, 'If the justice of God demand the endless punishment of the sinner, can justice ever possibly obtain its demands?' This question was asked to show, that if there were an endless penalty due to human crimes; that penalty could not come to an end, consequently no sinner could be saved—for as the law would for ever continue its demands, the sinner could never be saved, unless in violation of the demands of inflexible justice. To suppose that Christ suffered this penalty in our stead supposes that Christ suffered endless misery in a *short* period of time!

'Is sin in its nature finite, or infinite' was one of my questions, in replying to this, Truth has argued against his own hypothesis, as will shortly appear. The doctrine of endless suffering is founded upon the supposition that sin is infinite; for if sin be finite in its nature, it is finite in its consequences; for a finite cause cannot produce an infinite effect. To prove the infinity of sin, it is said that it is committed against an infinite God; but in reply I answer, finite man is not amenable to any law above his capacity.—The same argument that is relied on to prove the infinity of sin; if admitted, would prove the infinity of every thing God has made! If sin be infinite, then all sins are equal in magnitude, for there are no degrees in infinity. My opponent in arguing as I think, against himself says, 'the longer the sinner remains in impenitence, the more guilt he accumulates,' hence if there be any proportion between the greater and the lesser crime, neither can be infinite—it appears also if a man may increase in sin, he was not an infinite sinner when he first sinned. Again, if sin be infinite, then all sinners must unavoidably suffer an infinite consequence, for it is absurd to suppose that infinity can be removed, or that which is endless be brought to an end. Rom. 5. 8, 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.' If sin be infinite, was not St. Paul very much mistaken? If sin abound to infinity, how can grace abound much more? An infinite law can never be adapted to a finite being. It shall be required of every man according to that he hath. If what has been advanced be correct, and sin be limited within the finite circle of human capacity, there must be an end to all the consequences of human actions, and all endeavours to prove endless punishment must be fruitless; for a finite, or limited cause, cannot produce an infinite, or unlimited consequence. This is as clear as it is that 4 and 5 added do not make 75,000!

My third question to which T. has given no answer was, 'Can God be *good* to any being upon whom is inflicted never ending torments; if not, would it not be more consistent with *divine* perfection that such being should have been permitted *endlessly* to sleep in *non-existence?* The Psalmist declares that "the Lord is *good* to *all*, but the doctrine of endless misery evidently denies his goodness, in creating those who are to suffer its merciless torments. T. says "the means God is using to reclaim sinners are all that can be asked.' But does he really think God will use means that are *ineffectual?* Does he think that God will use all the means he possesses, and still suffer a defeat? Will God, like a poor, weak, irresolute, unskilful, earthly parent, strive a while to reclaim his disobedient child, and finally relinquish the task as beyond his power to accomplish? If he does, he believes in 'a God who *cannot* or who *will* not save.'

My fourth and last question was "Admitting God to possess the *will*, the *power*, and the *means* for the salvation of all mankind, is there any thing wanting to the final accomplishment of this all glorious event? In reply to this question T. says 'so I enquire, admitting God had the will, the power and the means, why was not the world of the ungodly saved from the deluge of old, as well as Noah and his family? Why did fire come down from heaven and destroy the inhabitants of Sodom? Why did the earth open and swallow up Korah and his company?—And why did fire go out from the Lord and consume Nadab and Abihu? God's will was, in this in no sense in which it is not in the infliction of punishment, in any case whatever, even up to the penalty of the law,' [but we have proved that the penalty of the law is not endless death] 'and he had equal power and means to prevent it.'

I would ask my opponent whether he seriously thinks it was *not* God's will to destroy the ungodly whom he has named, at the same time that he did destroy them? Was it ever God's *will not* to destroy those whom he *did* destroy? Does God ever act contrary to his own will? My opponent must prove that God did act *contrary* to his own will, before the instances he has named, will be parallel with the subject of our discussion. But this he surely cannot do, for the Lord says, Isaiah chap. 46, verse 10, "My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure,' and God 'worketh *all* things (not excepting the destruction of the old world, &c.) 'after the counsel of his own will,' Ephes. I, 11. But perhaps my opponent will say those who were destroyed in the instances he has named, were made endlessly miserable; I answer, the scriptures no where inform us that this was their fate, but we have reason to believe that in all God's dealings with his creatures, he consults their *good*: Take for instance the destruction of the Sodomites—speaking of this event, the Lord says by the prophet Ezek. 16, 50, "Therefore I took them away as I saw good.' If God took them away for their sins, and if they continue as sinful *after* having been taken away, as *before*, what *good* was done by taking them away? Will God act to no purpose? If the Sodomites are placed in unalterable misery, was God *good* to them in giving them an existence when he *knew* what would be their fate?

Therefore I took them away as I saw *good*', here is nothing indicating their eternal exclusion from *goodness*. Infinite *goodness* includes all created beings, infinite wisdom suffers no defeat, and infinite *power* accomplishes every divine purpose. All the punishment inflicted by our Creator upon his disobedient creatures, is intended to *reform* them and to do them *good*; and this gracious *intention* will be carried into complete effect. See Job 5, 8, 'Despise not thou the chastening of the Almighty, for he maketh sore and bindeth up, he woundeth and his hands make whole. See also Heb. 12th

As to what my opponent has said about the fearful and unbelieving and abominable,' &c. 'in a future world when restraining grace will be taken away,' &c. I would observe, he has not proved, but has taken for *granted* that the Revelator is speaking of such characters in a future *world* while I think it abundantly evident that he was speaking of characters in this *world*; and as to 'restraining grace being taken away,' this is a supposition unsupportable by scripture. From the 10th verse of the 20th chapter of Revelations, we learn that the 'torment' spoken of, was during the revolutions of time, i. e. *day* and *night* for-ever.' That the *second* death is suffered in this life, is plain from what the Revelator says to the churches chap. 2 verse 12, 'He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the *second death*, implying that he, the believer of those churches, should be hurt of the *second death*, if he did not overcome. The apostacy or falling away of the christian church is probably the *second death*. Rev. 14, 10 and 11. 'They shall be tormented with *fire* and *brimstone* in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb, and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast,' &c. Here the *torment* was during the *worship* and the worship, was during *day & night*. That many are most cruelly tormented, and tormented while they worship, tormented day and night with fire and brimstone, is so obvious at the present day, that it needs no further illustration!

Respecting the judgment spoken of in the 25th chap. of St. Math. I pledge myself to prove, that the events mentioned in that, and the two preceding chapters, were all confined to that generation for their particular fulfilment. See the 34th verse of the 24th chapter; also St. Math. 16, 27 and 28; likewise the last verse of the 8th chapter of St. Mark and the 1st verse of the 9th chapter. I know tradition places the coming of Christ at a period hereafter, but I am convinced that Christ has left direct testimony that this event should take place, during the life time of some of those who heard his words: but I need not labour this subject at this time.

What my opponent has said respecting my being called 'a Deist, Mahommedan,' &c. upon this, I have only to observe, that if he will examine the Koran and notice the curses pronounced upon all unbelievers, i. e. all who are not Mahommedans, which are contained in such expressions as the following, 'suffer in hell eternally,' 'burn in hell to all eternity,' &c. I should think he would find a compliment to those clergymen who are in the habit of blessing God with their tongues, and with the same tongue, cursing men who are made after the similitude of God. See St. James on this subject.

As to Deism it is believed that the contradictions ascribed to the Bible which are not therein contained, have driven many reflecting minds to reject the scriptures, who would otherwise rejoice in a well-grounded 'hope of eternal life.' In the language of an author now living, whose writings in favour of Universalism are unanswered and unanswerable; 'It is this heaven-dishonoring doctrine,' (the doctrine of endless misery) 'so repugnant to, and irreconcilable with the known goodness of God manifested to all nations in his divine providence, that has, more than any thing else, so buffetted all the best feelings of man, as in thousands of instances, to drive the heart of benevolence to lay aside the scriptures to whose authority this unmerciful doctrine has been erroneously ascribed.'

It is truly surprising to see the attempt my opponent has made to show want of candour in me where I quoted the language of St. Peter, Acts 3. 21 'The restitution of all things.' He says 'Benevolus has not told us what things those were of which the prophets spoke, as to be restored—he has left entirely out the limiting clause.' The language is not, 'whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, *of* which God hath spoken,' &c. as though there were some things *of* which the holy prophets had not spoken: but the language is, 'the restitution of *all things* which' (grand event) 'God hath spoken' (of as yet to be accomplished) by the mouth of all his *holy* prophets since the world began;' which makes it plain, that although *unholy* prophets, in different ages of the world may have testified the endless rebellion of a large portion of the rational creation of God, yet all his *holy* prophets have ever testified the restitution of *all* things without any limitation. As evidence of this, we appeal to

the 'law and the testimony.'

As we may reasonably suppose that the promise of God is the foundation of all the prophets have said on this subject, we will notice the promise. God says to Abraham Gen. 12. 'In thee *shall* all families of the earth be blessed,' no condition, no limitation. Again the heavenly message to Abraham is, Gen. 22 In thy seed *shall* all the nations of the earth be blessed.' no condition, no limitation. St. Peter doubtless understood this language in an unlimited sense, for in reference to it he says. Acts 3. 'In thy seed *shall* all the kindreds of the earth be blessed,' no condition no limitation. Put together these three words, all families, all nations and all kindreds, and then show any limitation or exception if language have any meaning. To show the nature of this blessing we have only to refer to Gal. 3, 8. 'And the scripture foreseeing that God would *justify* the heathen through *faith*, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee *shall* all nations be blessed.' The blessing promised is *justification* through *faith* If the scripture foresaw that God would justify the heathen through *faith*, and if God never should *justify* the *heathen* through *faith*, then the scriptures foresaw something that never did, nor never will come to pass!

That God never made any law to prevent the fulfilment of this glorious promise, is plain, see Gal. 3, 21. 'Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid.'—Heb. 6 chapt. 'God willing more abundantly to show unto the *heirs* of promise' (i. e. all families, all nations and all kindreds) 'the *immutability* of his counsel' (no uncertainty concerning it) 'confirmed it by an oath.'—God has unconditionally promised '*justification* thro' *faith*' to 'all families, all nations and all kindreds; he has sanctioned that promise by his solemn *oath*. now if countless millions of the human race, or even one, should be consigned to an endless hell, what would become of God's promise, and his oath? My soul is penetrated with the deepest *horror* at the thought of the *blasphemous* opinions of poor, short-sighted, deluded mortals! These opinions are doubtless unconsciously entertained.

I will now quote a few testimonies from the *holy* prophets. Speaking of the promised Messiah Isa. says chpt. 9 verse 7. 'Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end.' Where is the 'limiting clause?' Also Isa. 45, 22 and 23, 'Look unto me and be ye saved, all ye ends of the earth, for I am God and there is none else; I have sworn by myself; the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness and shall not return, that unto me *every* knee *shall* bow, every tongue shall swear.' Where is the 'limiting clause? Daniel 7, 14. 'And there was given him dominion, and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages *should serve him*.' Where is 'the limiting clause.'? Psalms 86, 9 'All nations whom thou hast made, *shall* come and worship before thee, O Lord.' Where is 'the limiting clause.'? With this testimony the language of the Apostle corresponds Col. 1, 20. 'And having made peace thro' the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things to himself, by him, I say whether they be things in earth or things in heaven.' No 'limiting clause.' Ephes, 1, 10. 'That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth.' No 'limiting clause.' Philip, 2, 9, 10, & 11. 'Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' No 'limiting clause.'

To all who limit the grace of God, 'who have made a covenant with death, and with hell are at agreement,' who confidently look forward to the enjoyment of heaven while witnessing the agonizing torments of their fellow-creatures in an unchangeable hell; to all such I say, in the language of the prophet Isa. 'Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand,' destruction shall sweep every 'refuge' of man's invention, and, 'all flesh shall see the salvation of God.' How consoling is the doctrine of eternal truth, the gospel of universal peace and good will; how happy is the man who can, at all times look for protection to a God of unbounded and unchangeable love! When we behold the selfishness, partiality, animosity, barbarity and wretchedness of our sinful race; how consolatory is the thought, that vice and misery shall come to a perpetual end; that when long succeeding ages shall have passed away, when the revolutions of mortality shall have ceased, and the all-destroying flood of time shall have rolled to the peaceful and boundless ocean of eternity, rivers of *life* and salvation, flowing from the Fountain of eternal joy, shall copiously and abundantly refresh the vast intelligent creation of God!!!

BENEVOLUS.

"He that will not reason, is a bigot; he that cannot reason, is a fool; and he that dares not reason is a slave."

POETRY.

SELECTED.

SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY.

Spirit of Christianity!
Humble plant of heavenly birth,
Faith and holy charity
Are thy precious fruits on earth.
Spirit of Christianity!
Come and visit earth again,
Bring, O bring, to dwell with thee
Peace, and love, and virtue's reign.
More than worldly pride or zeal,
More than fashion's ways inspire,
Or the creeds of men reveal,
More than these, dost thou require.
More than party names insure,
More than seeks the praise of men,
Piety that robs the poor,
Faith that works for worldly gain.
Can it be to hate mankind,
Even in a Saviour's name—
Was Christianity designed
But to wound our neighbor's fame?
Sly reproach and bickering strife,
But for mere opinion's sake;
Can they show the ways of life,
Or of heavenly things partake?
Was it thus the shepherd throng
Heard announced the gospel plan,
Such the enraptured angel's song
Of peace on earth, good will to man?
He whose words were life and peace,
Whom no party name confin'd,
Mark'd the milder way to bliss,
Love, his mission to mankind.
Not a God whose partial hate
Burning ere creation's morn,
Did he reveal—the infant's fate,
Eternal woe for being born.
No—'twas love and mercy shone
In all he did, and all he taught,
His doctrine was from God alone,
From Him the mighty works he wrought.
But if such my neighbor's creed,
Why should I his name destroy?
Can I hear Him vainly plead
For rights I still would fain enjoy?
Spirit of Christianity!
Hast thou lit the brands of death,
Nations robb'd of liberty,
Millions slaughter'd for their faith?
Hast thou broke life's mortal bands,
Bound in chains the human mind,
Shut with blood-polluted hands
The gates of Mercy on mankind?
No—those deeds of darkest name?
In the tragic book of Time,
Thy blest spirit must disclaim,
Unpolluted with a crime.
'Tis that fiend of giant reign,
Bigotry, when arm'd with power,
Crime which darker periods stain,
When the faggot could devour.
Even in this age of light,
Half subd'd the monster reigns,
Foaming, tho, of bloodless might,
Roaring "HERESY!" in chains:
Conscious of his waiting doom,
Plain he shows from whence he came,
In a face of milder gloom
Seems the Mammoth in the Lamb.
But as flies the cloud of night,
As the radiant day draws nigh,
So before the gospel light
Must the conquer'd monster fly.
More enlighten'd, milder too,
Man with Time advancing seems,
Grows more candid to review
Gloomy creeds and monkish dreams.
In the friendly march of mind
Conscience too redeems her claim,
Man a brother yet must find
Own'd in every sect and name.
Spirit of Christianity!
Let thy rain-bow tokens spread,
Peace and heaven-born Charity,
'Till from earth the clouds have fled.

Language similar to the following, quoted from Dr. Spring, has been used by church members in this vicinity! *Ed.*

From the N. Y. Gospel Herald.

ADVERTISEMET.

The Rev. Dr. Spring, on Sunday morning last, publicly excommunicated a member of his church for professing Universalism, when he made proclamation as follows:—"We trust there are no members in this error, but if there are, we request them to *keep it to themselves*, and they can be held in communion. But if they avow it, we shall be under the painful necessity of excommunicating them!"

If you please—*Only keep dark!* Believe just what you please, and hypocritically pretend to believe as I do, and pay me for preaching; and I will consider you good christians. This is accommodation with a witness. Dr. S. is growing kind and crafty. Take care of the *salary* friend.

OBITUARY.

Died in Le Ray on the 6th inst. Mrs. Marjery Steele, consort of Mr. Elisha Steele, in the 56th year of her age.—Amiable, discreet and benevolent, her partner, family and friends, severely feel their loss. She possessed patience in sickness, resignation in death, and hope in a blessed immortality.

ALSO, in this Village on the 15th inst. very suddenly, LORING, second son of Mr. Winslow Patridge, aged about four years.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY, IN WATERTOWN, N. Y. AT $1 PER ANN. PAYABLE IN ADVANCE,

*****
****

S. A. ABBEY, PRINTER.